DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 109 FL 010 124

AUTHOR O'Brien, Maureen M.
TITLE Group Learning in the Language Classroom: The Use of the Strip Story as a Teaching and Learning Technique.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 83p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Characteristics; *Adult Students; Class Activities; *Communicative Competence (Languages); Conversational Language Courses; *English (Second Language); *Group Activities; Group Discussion; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; Language Attitudes; *Language Instruction; Listening Comprehension; Listening Skills; Second Language Learning; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Strip Story Technique

ABSTRACT

Teachers of English as a second language need classroom communication activities to help students develop communicative competence. A procedure which uses a group-learning approach and which ensures real communication is the "Strip Story," an adaptation of scrambled story exercises in which each student is given one sentence of a story or anecdote at random; the sentences are numbered and the story must be reassembled strictly through verbal interaction. Five adult Japanese students were given the Strip Story exercises for a period of four weeks, with the hypothesis that student and group-oriented techniques like the Strip Story--wherein students have ultimate responsibility for their learning, the teacher is a 'facilitator of learning,' and adult learner characteristics are respected--produce increased listening comprehension and a more positive attitude toward English. Results showed that: (1) listening comprehension is an active process (not passive as is generally thought); (2) students use extralinguistic cues to convey meaning; (3) students produce real unpredictable communication, the problem itself stimulating interest; (4) a non-threatening atmosphere is more conducive to learning; (5) students are able to retain their own identity, as they draw on their own resources; and (6) students generally felt more positive about learning and speaking English. Further research is suggested, and strip stories and test results are appended. (Author/MHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

~~Book~~
MA

ED171109

GROUP LEARNING IN THE LANGUAGE CLASSROOM:

THE USE OF THE STRIP STORY AS A

TEACHING AND LEARNING TECHNIQUE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

AUGUST 1975

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maureen M. O'Brien
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

By

Maureen M. O'Brien

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

READING ROOM
Department of English
as a Second Language

THESIS COMMITTEE:

Ted Plaister, Chairman
Susan Fischer
Lauren Ekroth

FL010124

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is satisfactory in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language.

THESIS COMMITTEE

Ted Plaister
Chairman

Susan D. Franklin

Lamar E. Ekwall

Table of Contents

I. First and Second Language Acquisition.....1

1.1 Advantages of adult FL learners.....2

1.2 Need for new teaching and learning techniques.....3

1.3 Use of the Strip Story as a teaching and learning technique.....6

II. Learning as a Group Process.....11

2.1 Not a group process in typical language class.....11

2.2 Group learning effective not only in language classroom.....12

2.3 What happens in a class that practices group learning?.....17

III. Procedure of Investigation.....19

3.1 Subjects.....19

3.2 Testing.....21

3.3 Teaching.....24

3.4 Use of the Strip Story technique.....26

3.5 What happens?.....28

3.6 Daily class schedule.....32

IV. Test Results and Interpretation.....47

4.1 Variables.....47

4.2 Attitude Toward English Scale.....48

4.3 Performance Test.....51

V. Conclusions Based on Observation of the Strip Story Technique.....53

5.1 Listening is an active process.....53

5.2 Students use extralinguistic clues to convey meaning....53

5.3 Students really communicate.....55

5.4 Students participate without threat or fear.....56

5.5 Students can retain their own identity.....57

VI. Suggestions for Further Research.....60

VII. Appendices.....63

Appendix A--Strip Stories.....63

Appendix B--Attitude Toward English Scale.....66

Appendix C--Performance Test.....68

Appendix D--Attitude Test Results (By Group).....69

Appendix E--Attitude Changes (By Group).....70

Appendix F--Attitude Test Results (By Individual).....71

Appendix G--Performance Test Scores (By Individual).....72

Appendix H--Rank Ordering of Students.....73

Appendix I--t-Scores.....74

VIII. Bibliography.....77

I. First and Second Language Acquisition

Roger Brown (1973) describes child language acquisition as a "creative construction process," attributing to children specific innate mechanisms which guide their discovery of the rules of the language to which they are exposed. Although he cautions that "first and second language learning, often thought to be similar processes, may be profoundly and ineradicably different," (1973: 104) many other researchers suggest that the general process of second language acquisition may be similar to that of first language acquisition. (Corder 1967; Ravem 1968; Cook 1969, 1973; Cooper 1970; Dulay and Burt 1974; Ervin-Tripp 1974) Corder says that "it still remains to be shown that the process of learning a second language is of a fundamentally different nature from the process (of) primary acquisition." (1967: 164) According to him, both the first and the second language learner share basically the same capacity and the same strategies for language acquisition. There are, as Cook points out, two important issues involved in the assumption that the process of first language acquisition and that of second language acquisition are identical, or at least very similar: 1) whether children can learn a second language in the same way they acquired their first; 2) whether adults can learn a second language in the same way native children acquire their first. There is, according to Cook, little concrete evidence to suggest or deny this second issue. (1973: 13-14) Her own research has shown similarities between syntactic comprehension in foreign adults and native children, leading her to conclude that "at the moment there seems to be no certain evidence to show that adults are

different from children in language learning, once the other attributes of adults such as memory span are cancelled out. (1973: 28) Cooper, like Cook, has found little evidence that adults learning a second language differ significantly from children acquiring a first. According to him, both have to abstract the linguistic rules underlying the language and the sociolinguistic rules underlying its use. (1970: 312) However, to say that the child's innate capacity to learn a language is still present in adulthood and that L_1 and L_2 acquisition processes and strategies are basically the same does not say that native language acquisition and foreign language learning are identical. Corder, for example, points out that acknowledging this similarity in language learning strategies does not imply that the sequence of learning is the same in both cases (1967: 165). Nor does it say that child foreign language learning and adult foreign language learning are identical, or that similar foreign language teaching materials and methods will be equally successful for children and adults.

1.1 Advantages of adult FL learners

Ausubel feels that, contrary to the widespread belief that children are better language learners than adults, adults have a number of advantages over children learning a foreign language. According to Ausubel, children's cognitive immaturity and lack of certain intellectual skills which are present in adults keep them from making use of the language learning strategies used by adults. Adults have a much larger native-language vocabulary, especially with regard to abstract concepts. Therefore, in learning a foreign language they, unlike

children, do not have to acquire thousands of new concepts but merely the verbal symbols to represent these concepts. In learning the structure of a new language, adults can make conscious and deliberate use of grammatical generalizations and can explicitly apply them to suitable examples (1964: 421). Falk lists the following differences between children and adults learning a foreign language:

1. the adult has already mastered one language and therefore knows a large number of linguistic forms and rules;

2. the adult's nervous system and the muscles of his vocal tract are accustomed to transmitting and carrying out instructions for particular sets of phonetic features;

3. the adult has acquired certain strategies for learning new materials;

4. there is some evidence that adults can make changes in their native language system...only by adding extra rules; it is possible that this limitation affects foreign-language learning;

5. the adult knows a great deal about properties of meaning and the world. (1973: 258)

1.2 Need for new teaching and learning techniques

Significant differences have been shown to exist between the child and the adult learner of a foreign language, and research on whether children are in fact superior to adults as foreign language learners has been inconclusive at best. According to Jakobovits and Gordon, it will continue to be inconclusive, given the nature of the problem and the presently available research techniques (1974: 87). Despite these facts, foreign language teaching for both children and adults has for a number of years followed a similar path, the audio-lingual

approach, which seems eminently suitable in many ways to children. The audio-lingual approach has had as its theoretical basis the "habit formation theory" of language acquisition, which perceives language as "a set of habits acquired primarily through imitation and repetition, and set in motion by some external stimulus," (Falk 1970: 255) rather than as a set of rules to be discovered. Although the habit-formation theory has been challenged in recent years by the rule-discovery or "creative construction" theory, the audio-lingual approach has continued to dominate foreign language teaching. Thus, there has been continued emphasis on imitation and repetition, on induction, on avoidance of errors ("...the teacher finds as many ways as he can to prevent the occurrence of errors." Prator 1969: 100), and on constant speaking practice.

> Whereas the L_1 teacher can encourage pupils to speak one at a time and even allow them the option of remaining silent if they feel so inclined, the L_2 teacher is forced to rely much more heavily on formalized activities in which participation is obligatory. (Prator 1969: 100-101).

The continuing popularity of the audio-lingual approach is, perhaps, not solely linguistically based, but rather "a reflection of the widespread cultural belief that children learn languages much more readily than adults." The argument is that if children achieve such great success by means of an audio-lingual approach, it must be the most effective way of learning foreign languages, and adults should follow their example (Ausubel 1964: 420). Yet we have seen that children lack adult cognitive maturity and certain adult skills and abilities; this, not the intrinsic superiority of the audio-lingual approach, precludes for children different language teaching approaches

which are feasible for older age-groups. Because younger students seem to enjoy mimicry and repetition, because their cognitive development seems better suited to inductive reasoning, because they have not had as much opportunity as adults have had to develop their own strategies for learning new materials, the audio-lingual approach may be for them a suitable means of learning a new language. However, it should be clear that what is natural for one age group is not necessarily natural for another (Ausubel 1964: 420), and that what is needed is an exploration of alternate approaches that are suitable to the particular skills and needs of the foreign language learner. Dulay and Burt are not alone in their belief that

> Acceptance of the "creative construction process" involves rejection of the "habit formation" theory, some form of which underlies much of the current ESL teaching methodology. A switch in theoretical basis would mean a rethinking and revision of a great number of ESL teaching methods for children (1974: 130).

Nevertheless, it is not the purpose of this thesis to prove or disprove the fact that habit-formation-based audio-lingual methods and materials have been efficacious in foreign language teaching and learning, nor to prove "whether, in fact, the analogy between first and second language learning is sound." (Cook 1969: 207) Rather, I wish to suggest a technique which makes active use, as audio-lingual methods and materials generally do not, of what the L_2 learners as a group and the individual L_2 learners bring to the language learning situation, and which recognizes the importance of H. Douglas Brown's statement that even if we could determine all of the variables, cognitive and affective, in a particular individual, human beings are not totally consistent

and predictable from day to day or situation to situation. (1973: 242)

1.3 Use of the Strip Story as a teaching and learning technique

The Strip Story technique, as it has been named by its creator, Robert Gibson of the University of Hawaii's Department of English as a Second Language, meets, as I shall demonstrate, the criteria set up by Vivian J. Cook for "a method for teaching foreign languages that could justifiably claim to be based on first language acquisition...":

1. That it would allow the learner to progress by forming a series of increasingly complete hypotheses about the language.

2. That, consequently, it would permit, and indeed encourage, the learner to produce sentences that are ungrammatical in terms of full native competence, in order to test these hypotheses.

3. That it would emphasize the perception of patterns rather than the intensity of practice.

4. That its teaching techniques would include partial repetition of sentences, verbal play, and situationally appropriate expansions of the learner's sentences (1969: 210).

Gibson calls the Strip Story "a learning procedure which utilizes real communication activities to help students gain communicative competence." (1975: 154) Most ESOL teachers are aware of "the possible transfer value of well-established basic sentence patterns, especially if they are acquired in contextualized situations" (Ravem 1968: 185); and one would not expect to find much argument with Wilga Rivers' assertion that

> students must be trained from the first lesson to apply what they have memorized, or practiced in drills, in communication situations contrived within the classroom group (1971: 46).

If this is not done they, in her words, will be little more than

"well-trained parrots." Yet, says Gibson, teachers are constantly thwarted in their efforts to create real communicative learning situations in the classroom, particularly in their attempts to create realistic structure drills. Structure drills, by their very nature, demand tight control; this "tends to stifle anything resembling functional use of language, namely communication." (Gibson 1975: 154) Frustrated in their attempts at achieving real communication through dialogues and realistic structure drills, many teachers turn to so-called "free conversation" activities, which turn out to have little resemblance to conversation. What generally happens, says Gibson, is not the communication of unpredictable information, which he sees as the primary function of language, but merely the exchange of information that is all too predictable and familiar to them ("Where are you from?"). Another situation that arises in the "free conversation" class is one that is described by Rivers:

> The teacher may have chosen a topic which is uncongenial to him [the foreign language student] or about which he knows very little, and as a result he has nothing to express, whether in the native language or the foreign language (1971: 192).

The problem that ESOL teachers are faced with then, according to Gibson, is whether to "stifle" the students with too much control over the communicative exercise or to "overwhelm" them with not enough control. He has found in the Strip Story a technique that "allows the teacher to combine control (content, length and complexity of the actual sentences) with freedom (students interacting with each other in dealing with the sentences)" (1975: 158).

A Strip Story is a variation of the scrambled sentence type of

exercise, which presents a series of sentences out of sequence which students must then order into a correctly sequenced whole. In a Strip Story, a narrative with the same number of sentences as there are students in the class is typed with one sentence per line, and then cut up into strips. Each student is given, at random, a strip to memorize (Gibson suggests that no more than a minute be allowed for memorization). After the sentences have been memorized, the strips are discarded and the students are then assigned the task of reconstructing the story solely through verbal interaction. Students are allowed, indeed encouraged, to use any means at their disposal to solve the problem; the only restriction is that no writing is permitted. There are, in fact, two tasks involved in solving the problem of correctly sequencing the story. Before the class can work on putting the sentences into correct sequence, each student must share his or her sentence with the rest of the class. After all of the sentences are known, the task of reconstructing the story begins. When the students are satisfied with their sequencing of the story, they repeat it for the teacher, each student saying his or her sentence in order. Thus, the teacher plays no active role in solving the problem from the time the students are told to verbally reconstruct the story up until they retell the story. It is a completely learner-directed activity. One point that should be emphasized is that use of the Strip Story technique does not demand reading ability on the part of the students. Fairly short, simple sentences could be given individually to non-reading students, either by the teacher or by tape recorder.

The problem-solving approach to language learning is not a new

one. Carroll, in seeking a way to take the language learners' needs into account when planning language lessons, suggested the creation of a problem-solving situation for the learner in which he or she must find, by enquiring either of the teacher or of a dictionary, appropriate verbal responses for solving the particular problem. (1953: 188) In a Strip Story, however, it is the students, not the teacher, who are the source of information for the class. In the ESOL classroom, it has traditionally been the role of the teacher to play an active part in all language learning activities. The audio-lingual approach gives the teacher the responsibility for controlling the material that is presented, for keeping student errors at a minimum, for serving as a model of correct English, and even, according to Prator, for "supplying at least a portion of the natural motivation that is lacking." (1969: 102) Research on second-language learning has also focused attention on the teacher, rather than the learner, in that it has "paid primary attention to the manipulation of the structure and presentation of teaching materials." (Ervin-Tripp 1974: 111-112) Corder, however, points out that it is, in fact, not the teacher but the learner who controls the input--or more properly, the intake.

> The simple fact of presenting a certain linguistic form to a learner in the classroom does not necessarily qualify it for the status of "input." Input is "what goes in" not what is available for going in. (1967: 165)

The Strip Story technique recognizes, as few audio-lingual based techniques do, that L_2 learners, like L_1 learners, have ultimate responsibility for their own learning. The teacher's role in a Strip Story becomes one of "a facilitator of learning" (Gibson 1975: 158);

this is a role which both Gibson and I have found to be a very uncomfortable one, for by acting as facilitator, not as director or controller, the teacher appears to be doing nothing. By doing "nothing," however, the teacher can begin to deal successfully with the ever-present language teaching problem mentioned by Jakobovits and Gordon:

> It is sad, but we think essentially correct, to say that the development of communicative skills in a non-native language is, and has always been, a non-problematic, natural, and ordinary phenomenon until the attempt is made to teach it; at that point, we have invented a "learning problem," one that our "teaching" has been frustratingly incapable of solving. (1974: 82)

Rather than "teach" communicative skills, the teacher using the Strip Story technique instead facilitates the learning of these skills, thus handing over to the students a large amount of the autonomy and control that have traditionally belonged to the teacher. In doing this, Gibson says, one thing is certain: "Students teach themselves and each other, faster and more effectively, many of the things that teachers ordinarily have great difficulty teaching." (1975: 156)

It is the hypothesis of this thesis that use of the Strip Story with ESOL students will lead to better performance in English and a more positive attitude toward English.

A small study involving Japanese tourists studying English in Hawaii was done to see if in fact this might be true.

II. Learning As a Group Process

2.1 Not a group process in typical language class

An increasing number of researchers and educators have come to see the importance of learning as a group process, for just as people do not live totally alone, they do not learn totally alone. "Learning is a social affair and optimal learning can come only from social interaction." (La Forge 1971: 49) This is a fact that many language teachers fail to recognize, leading to the situation described by La Forge of the traditional class in which the students are "pitted against the teacher rather than joining in a common venture," the common venture being that of group learning. (1971: 49) His description of a class that does not have a commitment to group learning could, unfortunately, apply to a large number of ESOL classes.

> In the language class which has not been asked to accept the common task of group learning, the teacher dominates and controls the class activities. Each student tends to be in a competitive situation--winner or loser in the learning game. Some students suffer anxiety in the competition and, fearing failure and rejection, become apathetic and are inclined to withdraw. Some students develop a fairly high commitment to learning, but others seek to escape from as much learning as possible. Basically, parts of the class are at war with other parts, and teacher energy and class time are spent in keeping the dissonant parts in some degree of harmony. These forces may serve to protect the less committed students and to punish the "eager beavers." Little help in learning is given from student to student. The assumption seems to be that learning is an individual affair somewhat accidentally taking place in a group situation. (1971: 48)

Maslow points out what happens in the typical teacher-controlled classroom. First of all, students quickly learn that creativity is

punished and repeating memorized responses is rewarded. They understand that the unspoken goal of classroom learning is the reward of pleasing the teacher. In order to please the teacher, to respond in what they perceive as the correct way, they concentrate on what the teacher wants them to say rather than on understanding the problem, and "since classroom learning focuses on behavior rather than thought, the child learns exactly how to behave while keeping his thoughts his own." (1971: 181)

In the face of this, teachers in such classrooms are doomed from the start to fail at encouraging real communication in their language classroom, for real communication seems to imply sharing one's thoughts with others. The whole person is involved in such a sharing, not just the language learning part of the person. When one adopts this "whole person approach" to learning, says Curran

> The whole person is involved in learning--not simply his understanding and memory--while he is engaged in a concomitantly deep social experience that is filled with worth and meaning for him. He is no longer seen as learning in isolation and competition with others. He learns in and through them. (1972: 11-12)

2.2 Group learning effective not only in language classroom

Learning "in and through" others has proved to be an effective way to learn, not only in the language classroom. Don Rapp, Professor of Home and Family Life at Florida State University, has developed a teaching approach called Information Intermix which makes use of group learning. In a private correspondence recorded on tape, he expressed his thoughts on the Information Intermix approach. Rapp feels that

the American education system does not give students responsibility, but instead tells them what to do in the person of the classroom teacher. The result is that students are learning to take orders, not to think. The technique he has developed to give students responsibility for their own learning has a general resemblance to the Strip Story technique. An Information Intermix lesson follows this general format: A chapter in the textbook is divided into as many "bits" as there are students in the class. A "bit" may consist of a paragraph or it may consist of a page; the length is not important. What is important is "that people know that they are unique." Each student, who is a unique personality, now possesses a piece of information that is also unique. At this point each student knows that he or she has a unique "bit" of information to convey but does not yet know how it will be conveyed. In this way, says Rapp, "we activate their curiosity, and that is a powerful way to learn." The students begin to share their "bit" with the other members of the class by moving from student to student singly, in pairs, or in small groups. This enables a student to very quickly "get the meat...of what other people's "bit" of information is about. You can begin to sequence and order that information in your own way in your head." Thus, students are given the opportunity to go over the material many times rather than being expected to do what Rapp calls the impossible task of learning something by going over it just once. For learning to take place, he says, there must be practice, some kind of "working through," and this working through must be an emotional, social, physical, and mental experience, simultaneously. This seems to

parallel Curran's "whole person approach," which sees the learner as being "engaged in a concomitantly deep social experience that is filled with warmth and meaning for him." (1972: 11-12) The next step, after sharing their "bit" with their classmates and beginning to sequence and order the "bits" in their own mind, is for the students to reduce their "bit" to a single sentence, short phrase, or word which conveys what in that "bit" is important to them. Then the students gather in the center of the room and, as Rapp says, "spout off" these reduced "bits." One student at random begins and then any student who sees a logical relationship between that "bit" and his or her own "bit" says his or her own "bit." This enables the data to be integrated according to the students' sequence, not the author's sequence. These reduced "bits" can be written on the board as they are "spouted off" and as a final step in the Information Intermix process the students can be told to "take six of these thirty words" and make two sentences that sum up the chapter. This, says Rapp, enables them to throw away the "junk" and get down to the "jewel" of the chapter. The Information Intermix technique, he says, requires willingness on the part of the group. Some groups of students are so used to being "spoon fed" that they will not accept responsibility and resist the technique.

A similar teaching and learning approach was used in Austin, Texas (Aronson et al. 1975) in order to reduce racial tension in racially-mixed public elementary schools. Aronson's description of a typical Austin elementary classroom not using the new approach closely parallels La Forge's description of the language class which has not been asked to accept the common task of group learning. In

general, says Aronson, here is how it works:

> The teacher stands in front of the class and asks a question. Six to 10 children strain in their seats and wave their hands in the teacher's face, eager to be called on and show how smart they are. Several others sit quietly with eyes averted, trying to become invisible. When the teacher calls on one child, you see looks of disappointment and dismay on the faces of the eager students, who missed a chance to get the teacher's approval; and you will see relief on the faces of the others who didn't know the answer. (1975: 44)

Aronson's account of how this process affects students closely resembles Maslow's description of what attitudes the teacher-dominated classroom produces in students. This is what Aronson observed:

> Through this process the students learn that there is only one expert in the classroom, the teacher, and that there is one and only one correct answer to those questions, namely the answer the teacher has in her head. The children also learn that the payoff comes from pleasing the teacher, by showing her how smart, quick, neat, and well-behaved they are. This game is fiercely competitive and the stakes are high, because the kids are competing for the love and approval of one of the two or three most important people in their world. (1975: 44, 47)

With pleasing the teacher and proving oneself superior to one's classmates as the prizes that the students are competing for, this type of teacher-dominated process, says Aronson, guarantees that the students will not learn to like and understand each other. (1975: 47) Furthermore, when Blacks and Chicanos were bused into schools that forced them to compete with white students, as was the case in Austin, they were "virtually certain to lose the game because of their poorer preparation." (1975: 47) These minority-group students were denied fulfillment of what Curran calls the learner's "basic need to be given a sense of self-worth and value in and through the person representing

the subject to be learned [i.e. the teacher] as well as from others engaged in the learning process." (1972: 21)

Aronson and his associates felt that what was needed in Austin was a change in the process of education so that students would learn to use one another as resources. Their reasoning was that this change would have a beneficial effect on the relationships of all the students, not just the minority-group members. (1975: 47)

The approach they suggested, the "Jigsaw Approach," involved dividing a class into learning groups of six students each, and following the principle of the jigsaw puzzle, giving each student a piece of information; it would then take all six group members to put the puzzle together. One such "puzzle," given to a fourth-grade class, was a six-paragraph biography of Joseph Pulitzer. Each student in each learning group was given a different paragraph, which dealt with a major aspect of Pulitzer's life. Thus, every learning group had the entire life story of Joseph Pulitzer, but no single student had more than one-sixth of the story, and was dependent on the other group members to complete the biography. The students were told that they were to master their paragraph and teach it to the others in their group, and that they would be tested afterwards on the life of Joseph Pulitzer. After going off on their own to learn their paragraph, and, in some cases, going to consult their counterparts in other learning groups, the students rejoined their groups to exchange their pieces of the biography. In order to complete the task successfully,

> they had to teach each other and listen to each other. They would have to realize that none of them could do well without the aid of everyone else in the group, and

> that each member had a unique and essential contribution to make. (1975: 47)

Aronson and his associates noted, as was the case in the Information Intermix approach, that cooperation did not happen all at once; it took several days before the students could use the technique effectively, without reverting to their competitive habits. However, once they began to feel comfortable with the technique, they were enthusiastic about it. At the end of one six-week experiment involving ten teachers from schools throughout Austin, the researchers found that

> the kids were happier, felt better about themselves, and liked their classmates more as a result of cooperative groups, and that these good feelings did not interfere with learning and performance. (1975: 49)

2.3 What happens in a class that practices group learning?

The following description of what happens in a class group that has accepted the common task of enhancing individual learning can be applied to the Information Intermix approach, the Jigsaw approach, and the Strip Story approach to teaching and learning:

> Difficulties in learning for any individual become the concern of others. Emotional support is supplied by the group to the student, thereby giving acceptance and membership to the student receiving help. Feedback about performance and corrective information can be given by student to student as well as by teacher to student, when the class-group climate is less competitive, less individually rejective, and less punishing, and when, consequently, individual defensiveness is reduced..." (La Forge 1971: 49)

In a language class, one would expect this "learning as a group process" approach to have positive results if one accepts H. Douglas Brown's contention that "the self-knowledge, self-esteem, and self-confidence of the language learner could have everything to do with

success in learning a language." (1973: 233)

The following sections describe some of the results of the Strip Story approach to language teaching and learning.

III. Procedure of Investigation

3.1 Subjects

Two groups of Japanese tourists studying English in Hawaii for four weeks were chosen as subjects. Originally there were nine students in the experimental group (Group B) and eight in the control group (Group A), but because seven students either missed the pre- or post-test or did not attend class, the final number was ten--five in each group. Because of a technical problem with one of the Group B pre-test performance tapes, that student's scores could not be counted in the final test results. However, his pre-test performance scores and his pre- and post-test attitude scores were included in the discussion of the technique.

All of the students were post-high-school age, and all had studied English in Japan for a minimum of six years. They were placed in the two lowest of five groups on the basis of a two-part placement test (listening comprehension--which also involved choosing correct grammatical forms--and reading). One student received a high score on the listening comprehension section of the test (45) but was placed in Group A at his own request. The placement scores of the two groups were very similar, as is shown below:

Listening Comprehension		Reading	
Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B
45	37	22	23
38	36	16	22
29	35	15	19
29	34	12	18
29	33	11	15
26	32	11	14

21	30	11	14
15	30	6	12
	26		9

Because previous groups of students in this English program had studied in classes of from twelve to fifteen students, most of these students would have been placed in a single class on the basis of their placement test scores, had the whole group been as large as previous ones. The ages of the experimental group ranged from nineteen to forty-one. Although they had all studied English in Japan, none of them had ever studied with a native speaker of English, and all of them had difficulty--from average to quite severe--understanding English and communicating in English. As the students will be referred to by name in later discussion of the Strip Story technique, their names and some biographical information follow:

NAME AND SEX	AGE	OCCUPATION	EDUCATION
Yozo (M)	33	Mitsubishi Company Worker	High School Graduate
Mariko (F)	19	Junior College Student	Completed One Year of Junior College
Hashi (M)	41	Businessman	Industrial College Graduate
Kaji (M)	26	Office Worker	Industrial College Graduate
Kazuyo (F)	26	Enrolled in Dressmaking School	High School Graduate

Group B was chosen as the experimental group because I intended to videotape some of the experimental group's classes, and the videotape equipment was available during more of Group B's meeting times than of Group A's.

3.2 Testing

On the first day of instruction, both groups were given a pre-test in the language laboratory at the University of Hawaii. The same test was given as a post-test at the end of the four-week program. The test took approximately thirty minutes to administer. It consisted of two parts: a written test measuring their attitude toward English and an oral one measuring their performance in English.

The attitude test is an adaptation of the Desire to Learn French Scale which appears in Leon Jakobovits' Foreign Language Learning. (1970: 272-273) Certain items which were felt to be potential cultural problems for Japanese students were eliminated. As this test was not of English but of attitude, Miho Steinberg, of the Department of English as a Second Language, translated it into Japanese, rewriting some items which she felt were ambiguous in Japanese, and others which seemed to be seeking a particular "correct" answer.[1] In its final form, the attitude test consisted of seven multiple-choice items.

The performance test was designed to measure the students' ability in the following areas: 1) reading English with some degree of correct pronunciation, stress, and intonation; 2) understanding the question or command which they had read aloud; 3) giving an appropriate response to each of the items they had read. The students recorded their tests on cartridge tapes controlled by the master panel; there was no need, therefore, for them to manipulate the recording equipment. The test

---

[1] I wish to acknowledge Professor Steinberg's assistance in the adaptation and translation of the test.

consisted of ten short items which the students were instructed to read aloud and then to answer orally. In order to make sure that the students were completely clear about what they were to do, the directions were written in Japanese at the top of each test. Miho Steinberg came to the pre-test room and explained the directions in Japanese to make sure that there were no misunderstandings. All of the items on the test dealt with subjects that the students were familiar with (the weather in Hawaii, the four seasons in Japan, their families, etc). None of the items could be answered by a simple "yes" or "no" response. Five of them called for short answers (#1, 2, 4, 5, and 7); four could be correctly answered with a relatively short answer or be elaborated on if the student so chose (#3, 6, 8, and 9); and one could have elicited anything from just a few words to a very long, elaborate answer (#10). It was felt that #8 would be the most difficult for the students to answer, and that in fact was the case. A majority of the students in both groups had difficulty with the "look like" construction. Only three students received full credit for making an appropriate response to that question.

The scoring of the performance test was done in the following way: Two listeners (Neal Scott, a graduate assistant in the Department of English as a Second Language, and I) listened to each tape, independently of one another, and rated each one according to overall impression. Each student was assigned a score of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest. In cases where we had assigned different ratings (8 out of 18 cases) the two scores were averaged. In only one of the 8 cases was the discrepancy more than one point. In the case of two students, our

scores disagreed on both the pre-test and the post-test. After rating the students by overall impression, we listened to each tape again, independently of one another, and scored each question and answer individually. In scoring the tapes the second time, each item was divided into two categories: Question and Answer. The Question category was further divided into three subcategories: Correctness (that is, did the student read the question as it was actually written?); Pronunciation; Rhythm, Stress, and Intonation. On the original scoring sheet, I had divided the Question category into only two subcategories: Pronunciation and Rhythm. However, it soon became evident that a place was needed for Correctness, as several students with fairly good pronunciation and/or rhythm were not reading what was on the list of questions. (Several, for example, read "Where were you born?" instead of "When were you born?") It was also evident that some students, while maintaining a fairly good rhythm pattern, were using unnatural stress and intonation patterns. Therefore, the Correctness subcategory was added and the Rhythm subcategory was expanded to include Stress and Intonation as well. The Answer category for each item was divided into four subcategories: Appropriateness (that is, did the answer give the information that was asked for in the question as it was written?); Pronunciation; Rhythm, Stress, and Intonation; Syntactic Correctness. Each 1 subcategory for each item was given a score of from 1 to 5, with 5 as the highest. A score of 5 did not necessarily imply a completely error-free answer, particularly with regard to the last subcategory, Syntactic Correctness, for both Scott and I agree with Ervin-Tripp's statement that "second language learners can

successfully communicate in spite of quite deviant grammar in certain respects." (1967: 80) We were primarily interested in how successfully the students communicated, so that one or two errors in any of the subcategories that did not impede successful communication did not always keep us from assigning a score of 5 to that subcategory. Because our opinions differed on how "successfully" the student was communicating despite mistakes, our scores did not always agree. Each item had a maximum possible score of 35 and a minimum of 7, and because the subcategory scores were added and then averaged, each subcategory had a maximum overall score of 5 and a minimum of 1. These average scores for each of the seven subcategories were added to get the second listening score. Scott's score and mine were then averaged to get each student's final second listening score. The maximum possible score for the second listening was 35 and the minimum was 7.

3.3 Teaching

Each group of students received eighteen hours a week of English instruction, plus an additional two hours devoted to such activities as movies, informal discussions, singing, and field trips. They were taught by five different teachers and had classes in speaking (9 hours), reading (3 hours), writing (2 hours), and structure (4 hours). For both the experimental and the control group, I was assigned four of their nine hours devoted to speaking. Because of two holidays that occurred during the four-week program, the actual number of hours that I met each group was 15 for the experimental and 14 for the control group.

The experimental group used no teaching materials other than Strip Stories. Class time was devoted to putting the stories together and to various follow-up activities. All of the follow-up activites, except for dictation of five of the seven stories we did, were a result of questions from the students, problems that had come up in ordering the stories, or students' requests to talk about the topic of a particular Strip Story.

The control group used a wide variety of materials and techniques. Class activities were fairly equally divided between those that promoted listening comprehension and those that promoted oral fluency. Neither group was ever told to use only English in the classroom, for I agree completely with Ravem's belief that "the first language...is a source the learner can draw on." (1968: 184) Group B used a great deal more Japanese than Group A did. A large part of the sequencing of the Strip Stories was done in Japanese, while very little of the subsequent discussion of the topics covered in the stories involved the use of Japanese. While Group A used much less Japanese in the classroom, they seldom spontaneously asked questions or initiated discussion. The major exceptions to this were an interviewing activity in which they had to use English to get certain biographical information from me and which gave them the opportunity to ask any questions they wanted, and an activity which required one student to describe a simple line drawing on an index card which the other students were to duplicate on blank cards, following his or her directions. In both of these activities, students were so intent on communicating that they lost their inhibitions and were willing to use any means at their disposal

to get their message across, even if it meant saying something "incorrectly." In these activities they most closely resembled the students using the Strip Story technique. I tried to use a large number of open-ended classroom activities with Group A, activities which could go in the direction that the students led them, and which would allow the students to talk as much or as little as they chose. However, although the students participated enthusiastically in the classroom activities and seemed to enjoy them, they seldom, with the two exceptions noted above, initiated questions or discussion. And, unlike the students in the experimental group, their questions and discussion were never about anything that had not been introduced by me in presenting the activity.

3.4 Use of the Strip Story technique

Each lesson using the Strip Story technique followed the same general pattern: The strips were passed out for memorization and then discarded; the students worked on putting the story together, and when they were satisfied with their ordering, they brought me back into the activity to listen to the story as they had reconstructed it. As they worked on the story, I made notes of recurring grammatical and organizational difficulties. I found to be true Gibson's assertion that

> every time this technique is used, some unpredictable learning takes place as a result. For this reason, the teacher's role as an observer becomes very useful. By not directing the procedure, the teacher is free to take notes on problems and to acknowledge problems that are being dealt with effectively. (1975: 158)

When the teacher takes on the role of observer, he or she can

begin to teach students rather than teaching language, and can begin to structure lessons around students' particular needs. Some of the "needs and opportunities" that an individual student might have, according to Stevick, are for satisfaction from having done something right; for transmitting and receiving "real messages"; for satisfying "his drive to acquire knowledge that he can project into future events that he cares about"; for being aggressive "in making sense out of nonsense--to acquire skills and insights actively rather than having them 'skillfully presented and sufficiently drilled' into him"; for "developing personal relationships with people who interest him." (1971: 23-25)

By acting as an observer, the teacher using the Strip Story technique does what Rivers suggests, that is, lets the students talk without interruption. She says that "it is obvious that continual interruption to correct every mistake will discourage, frustrate, and inhibit the students, so that they...cease to speak freely." (1971: 204) Therefore, she suggests that teachers listen carefully for consistent inaccuracies, unobtrusively make note of them, and practice them with the class later.

After the students had retold the story to me, each student said his or her sentence again in sequence while the rest of the class wrote it. This gave every student a complete copy of their version of the story. When the dictation was finished, I gave each student a copy of the original story, which they compared to the one they had written. Then we discussed differences between their stories and the original (and often between their version and other students' versions of the

dictation); we also discussed students' questions about vocabulary and structure. Some of the stories, such as the one on the wonders of Hawaii, led to discussions that continued well into the next class hour.

3.5 What happens?

When one first begins to use the Strip Story technique, "it might appear that solving the problem by putting the story back together is the most important part of the procedure. It is not. What happens as a result of the students' attempts to solve the problem is the real meat of this technique." (Gibson 1975: 156) What does happen as the students try to solve the problem?

Every student is required to participate in order to solve the problem. Because each student is the only source of his or her sentence, everyone must speak at least once. However, because students are never forced to say what they do not already know, they are not threatened by having to speak. Furthermore, the student who is shy or fearful does not have to say anything more than his or her own sentence. In a language class, as in life in general, "a person diligently strives for those things that tend to build or restore self-esteem." (H. Douglas Brown 1973: 234) Most language classes do not allow students the freedom to do this, particularly those students who

> are, by nature, cautious or meticulously careful; still others are unduly sensitive, and therefore easily embarrassed or upset it found to be in error or not understood. Students in each of these categories often prefer to say nothing rather than run the risk of expressing themselves incorrectly. (Rivers 1971: 193)

In most current ESOL classrooms, there is heavy emphasis placed on

speaking; students are not given the opportunity to exercise their preference to remain silent. In a Strip Story, students' active participation--after they have said their sentence once--may take the form of speaking, or of listening to what the other students are saying. The importance of listening in the foreign language classroom is becoming more and more apparent. Jakobovits and Gordon point out that "the deep structure analysis of a sentence is similar whether you generate it or someone else does it for you...syntactically you are equally active in both situations." (1974: 13) Both Angelis (1973: 103) and Carroll call listening comprehension an "active" process, and not the "passive" skill that it is often seen as. Says Carroll:

> When we talk about "active" listening, the students' responses do not necessarily have to be overt. In the process of learning, the students are constantly making active decisions or choices...in listening comprehension they could be making decisions or choices about the meaning of what they hear. (1973: 357)

Besides ensuring the active participation of all students, the Strip Story technique allows real communication to occur, for students are getting and giving unpredictable information. In much current ESOL teaching, attempts at achieving real communication in the classroom fail because "what has been less emphasized...is that communication is a process involving at least two people. Speaking does not of itself constitute communication unless what is said is comprehended by another person." (Rivers 1966: 196) Students using the Strip Story technique use all of their communicative skills in order to make sure that what they are saying is being comprehended--that is, to make sure that they are communicating. In most foreign language classes, "according to

Macnamara the student seldom has anything so urgent to say to the teacher that they will improvise with whatever communicative skills they possess to get their meaning across." (Rubin 1975: 43) This is not true in a class using the Strip Story technique, in which the students use all of the communicative skills at their command--paraphrasing, spelling, translation, gestures, facial expression, acting out--in order to get their meaning across, not to the teacher, but to their classmates.

Because of this need to communicate with their classmates, students "find it essential, often for the first time, to listen to each other instead of the teacher." (Gibson 1975: 156) They are no longer interested in showing the teacher that they know the "correct" response, but instead become totally involved in understanding and being understood, which Gibson calls the "crux of the Strip Story problem." One immediately evident result of this is great attitudinal change on the part of the student regarding pronunciation. Says Gibson:

> Often an individual student's pronunciation is poor, but the student feels it is not a serious problem. Under such circumstances, most adult students will make little progress in pronunciation. It is easy for them to attribute their pronunciation problems to an over-critical teacher. However, when the Strip Story is used, every student must be understood or the technique will not work. After trying several times to say something, each time being met by quizzical stares or by "What?" or by "Would you repeat please?" students become convinced that they do have a serious problem, serious because it prevents them from being understood. Until that realization is reached, I am convinced that most adults will make no significant progress in pronunciation. (1975: 158)

Although Gibson's experience with the Strip Story has been with classes of students from many different language backgrounds, there was also a great deal of self-correction of pronunciation in my classes

of Japanese students, more, in fact, than I had expected. For example, in the dictation of Strip Story #3, Mariko kept pronouncing the word "filled" as "field." When Kazuyo finally said, "Spell," she realized that the other students were misunderstanding her and she made a conscious effort to say "filled" from then on. As the students became more used to using one another as resources, they began to realize that they did not always have to depend on me to explain vocabulary that they did not understand. Knowing that they might at some time be the source of information for another student seemed to make the students much more willing and less embarrassed to admit that they did not understand something and to ask their classmates for an explanation.

As a result, "when this technique is used, the environment is much freer and non-threatening." (Gibson 1975) In such a non-threatening classroom, where students are actively involved in their own and one another's learning, the common attitude described by Jakobovits and Gordon does not seem to be present:

> There seems to be a qualitative difference for many learners in the significance they attach to making errors while speaking in a foreign language versus getting an answer wrong in another subject...there is something either sacrilegious or idiotic in unintentionally murdering a sentence...this attitude serves to inhibit and retard the expressive leap in a second language. (1974: 12)

Once the focus is off the foreign language and on solving a problem which happens to require the use of the foreign language for its solution, and once the students become involved in each other's learning, they become less fearful, less inhibited, and more able to make that "expressive leap."

3.6 Daily class schedule

Day 1

Hour 1: Pretest

Hour 2: Strip Story #1 (Strip Stories appear in Appendix A)--After I had explained the technique, I passed out the strips and collected them after one minute. There followed four minutes of unbroken silence and another three minutes and six seconds of mumbling and one-to-one conversation, mostly in Japanese. At this point, I left the room, hoping that my absence would make the students less inhibited and more willing to begin sharing their sentences and ordering the story. When I returned eight and a half minutes later, the students were talking animatedly in a mixture of Japanese and English, asking one another to repeat their sentences, translating parts of sentences into Japanese, and carrying on extended discussion about possible sequencing. The level of talk dropped as soon as I came back into the room, and within thirty seconds the room was silent again. When I asked, "Are you ready?" Kaji sheepishly said, "No--we were talking." Although I had told them to "work together to put the story together," they still obviously felt that they must be doing something wrong by talking together instead of sitting quietly until the "correct" answer somehow came to them. When I said, "Oh, good! Go on talking and just let me know when you're ready," they all looked very much relieved that they had not been doing something wrong, and went back to working on the story while I sat at my desk unobtrusively making notes on the lesson. After twelve minutes and nine seconds they were ready to retell the story to me. They had put the sentences into the

following order: #6, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8. The remaining twenty-one minutes of class time were spent on the students' dictation of the story. Besides saying their own sentence a number of times, students were saying things like, "Repeat," "Spell, please," "See or sees?" (Actually, the word was "seize"; Kazuyo, who had that sentence said "Not see, sees--another seize." She then spelled the word and demonstrated it with a quick grabbing motion.) At the end of the class hour, each student had a copy of the story, following their sequencing. Their version began with the sixth sentence, "He decided to steal that piece of meat..." Mariko, who had that sentence, had deleted the word "too" in giving her sentence.

Day 2

Hour 3: We spent thirty-seven minutes working on the previous day's Strip Story. First the students compared their own versions with the dittoed copy I passed out. When Kazuyo saw Mariko's sentence, she laughed and said, "Oh, you forgot too," and Hashi said, "First a dog steal meat and then steal 'that piece of meat too'." Kaji turned to Yozo and said a few sentences in Japanese, in which the words "dog" and "he" were the only English ones. Then Kaji said to me, "He is the dog?" I told him yes and pointed out to them that beginning the story with "he" doesn't let them know who "he" is, while beginning with "a dog" does.

When Yozo asked for the meaning of "butcher shop," Hashi said, "meat shop"; then Hashi asked Kazuyo for the meaning of "seize" and she gave him the Japanese translation while demonstrating with the same

hand motion she had shown Mariko.

For the next thirteen minutes we worked on Strip Story #2; I tape recorded the students as they worked on this story. One of the students who had been in the class the previous day had moved to another class and another one was absent. (He continued to be absent for the rest of the program.) Because there were now only six students in the class instead of eight, I removed sentences #6 and 7, combined them into a single sentence, and wrote it on the board. In putting the story together, the students were to fit that sentence into its correct place.

This time there was no silence or hesitation; as soon as they had discarded their strips, they began to say their sentences one by one. Two students tried to write their sentences before discarding their strips and I stopped them, for I had found when using Strip Stories in other classes that letting students see one another's sentences makes communication unnecessary and little if any talking and listening occur.

From the beginning, Yozo had trouble making the other students understand him when he said "wolf," so he began spelling it; soon other students were giving the correct pronunciation of the word when Yozo said it, and he was soon saying it so that it could be recognized. Hashi also spelled so that he would be understood. After saying his sentence (#2) the first time, he spelled "amuse." Jun, in sentence #4, pronounced "arrived" as "alive." When Kazuyo asked, "alive?" he answered, "arrived" with heavy emphasis on the final sound. When the class ended at 10:21, the students had not finished sequencing the

story to everyone's satisfaction. I told them to remember their sentences and that we would continue with the story the next day.

Day 3

Hour 4: Before continuing their work on the story, the students asked to hear the previous day's tape; we spent eleven minutes listening to it.

The class now numbered five because Jun was absent. Working together, the students were eventually able to remember Jun's sentence (#4). They asked to have written on the board the sentence that had been written there the previous day (#6), but they did not have Jun's sentence written for them.

The fact that having the teacher in control of the lesson inhibits the students' free expression was made very evident to me. The students seemed to be having trouble remembering Jun's sentence so I suggested that before they began working on the story, each student might say his or her sentence in an effort to help them remember Jun's sentence. With me in front of the room listening to their sentences, they became quite hesitant and obviously concerned with making their sentences as correct as possible. When a student forgot a word, there was complete silence on the part of the individual and the other students. After just under three minutes of this, I realized that the students were perfectly capable of remembering Jun's sentence themselves or of devising a strategy to get around the problem of their not remembering. Therefore, I told them to continue on their own and let me know when they were ready to retell the story. As soon as I had sat down and occupied

myself with writing, they began saying their sentences again, interrupting one another to supply missing words, asking questions in Japanese and in English, and eventually remembering Jun's sentence without any difficulty. They became involved again in solving the problem rather than interested in pleasing me. After working on the story for forty-one minutes, the class took a ten-minute break and returned for the second hour.

Hour 5: After eleven minutes, the students were satisfied with their ordering of the story, which agreed with the original. They spent another nineteen minutes on the dictation, which, as in the first Strip Story, involved more English than the ordering of the story had. Students continued to rely on Japanese to explain meaning (for example, when Kazuyo dictated the first sentence, Yozo explained the word "shepherd" in Japanese to the rest of the class), but they also used English to ask one another to "Please spell," or to tell a student, "Again please," to correct one another, to add the missing parts of their classmates' sentences and, of course, to dictate their own sentence.

The remaining sixteen minutes of the class were devoted to various things that the students brought up--the spelling change in "lie" vs. "liar," the opposite of "wild," the fact that this story was familiar to the students, but in the version they were familiar with, the boy died.

Day 4

Hour 6: This was the last time that there were six students in

the class. Jun, who had been absent from the previous day's class, was present for the last time during the program. Because the students were delayed coming from their previous hour's class, this lesson began ten minutes later than usual and took only forty minutes instead of the usual fifty. They immediately asked to hear the previous lesson's tape recordings; we spent fifteen minutes listening and then I passed out Strip Story #3. As soon as they had discarded their strips, everyone began to say his or her sentence at once. The story took them twenty-four minutes to sequence to their satisfaction. This was the liveliest story so far and the one that provoked the most discussion during the sequencing--most of which was done in Japanese. There was some English used while they were ordering the story and there was also an increasing lack of hesitancy about correcting one another's mistakes and admitting one's own uncertainties. Jun at one point said "were" instead of "are" in his sentence (#4) and immediately said "Maybe." When Yozo kept saying "...there is a flower" in sentence #3, both Hashi and Kazuyo, at different times, asked "A flower?" to which Yozo always replied decisively, "A flower." (This error remained in the dictated version of the story.) This was the first story in which a student indicated awareness of missing a part of his sentence. Kaji, in saying sentence #5, both in the sequencing and the dictation, inserted "um-um" and tapped on the desk to indicate the missing words "Orientals" and "people" after the word which was "Caucasians" in the original but which Kaji changed to "Micronesians" at one point. By the time the hour ended, the students were not yet satisfied with their ordering so we planned to continue with the story during the next

class meeting.

Day 5

Hour 7: The first fifteen minutes of the class were devoted to ordering the previous lesson's Strip Story to the students' satisfaction. The next fourteen minutes were spent on the dictation. During this dictation, more English was used than in previous ones; even Yozo, the weakest student, used English instead of Japanese when asking students to spell words or repeat parts of their sentence. For the first time, Yozo made a spontaneous comment ("It's a short sentence.") when another student asked him to repeat his sentence. Students continued to correct one another in a non-threatening way. Kaji, for example, corrected Kazuyo's mispronunciation of "climate," and she, in turn, corrected Mariko, who was saying "filled" as "field." The problem of "a flower" came up again while Yozo was dictating his sentence. After Yozo, at Hashi's request, had repeated sentence #3, Hashi asked "A flower?" then turned and asked Kaji the same thing. Kaji replied in Japanese and then said in English, "Some flowers."

Instead of passing out dittoed copies of the original, I had each student write his or her sentence on the board in order; then the rest of the students made additions and deletions. They spent twelve minutes making the corrections. This is how the story looked after corrections had been made by the students. Student corrections are indicated by a circle.

Hawaii is filled with many wonders. (Mariko)

First, there is a pleasant climate, which is cause by north ~~northeast~~ wind. (Kazuyo)

Second, there was a flower. (Yozo)

Finally, there are ~~were~~ people. (Jun)

The population is made of Cau _____ _____

and _____ from Pacific Ocean, Hawaiian. (Kaji)

All these people together harmonized ~~harmony~~. (Hashi)

Finally, I passed out dittoed copies of the story and the students compared theirs to the original. Then they asked a number of questions about pronunciation ("climate," "pleasant," and "Caucasians") and about vocabulary ("trade wind," "Caucasians," and "harmoniously" They were able to guess that "harmoniously" meant "happily.") This took thirteen minutes.

Hour 8: After a ten-minute break, the class resumed and for the remaining thirty-eight minutes they talked about "the wonders of Hawaii," the things and places that they had seen in Hawaii and whether they had liked them. A few minutes before the class ended Hashi asked me if I had ever been to Japan and when I said no he began to tell me about some of the "wonders of Japan," particularly those in his home town. The other students began to tell me what there was to do and see in their area of Japan, and we decided to continue the discussion during our next class meeting.

Day 6

Hour 9: The students continued telling me about the areas they thought would interest me as a visitor. This took fifteen minutes. The remaining class time was spent videotaping Strip Story #4. The story was videotaped in a classroom with the students sitting at their desks as they had been during the previous three stories.

The students did not seem at all self-conscious about being videotaped. In fact, they used more English while arranging this story than they had for the previous ones. Previously, indicating the correct order of the sentences had been done primarily either in Japanese or by gesture; however, in this story, most of the ordering was done in English, along with the use of gestures. Although they did not seem to be threatened by the videotape equipment, they did seem to be a great deal more concerned than before with the correctness of the individual sentences and of the story as a whole. After they had been working on the story for just over twelve minutes, the story was arranged and Yozo called to me, "Okay!" indicating that they were ready to say the story for me. Kaji, however, gestured and said, "No, no!" They then continued to work on the story for almost thirteen minutes, going into quite extended discussion, both in Japanese and in English, about which ideas should occur first and which ones later. This involved a great deal of paraphrasing of the sentences and explanation in Japanese of what each sentence was about. They were also very much concerned with trying to fill in the missing gaps in their sentences, something that had been of great concern to them only in the aforementioned Strip Story #2. Their final version was

ordered in the same way as the original and in the same way as the version that they had come up with almost thirteen minutes earlier.

Day 7

Hour 10: We began immediately to videotape the dictation of the previous day's Strip Story. Because it was difficult to get all five students in camera range at the same time, they were seated very close together. For the first time, they were able to see one another's papers during the dictation. They began the dictation as they had begun the three previous ones, by writing their own sentence, but the rest of the dictation was not conducted in the same way that the previous ones had been. Because they could easily see the paper of the person on either side of them, they copied from a neighbor anything they did not catch when the sentence was dictated. There was little need for verbal communication--requests to have a word or phrase repeated, questions about spelling, requests to speak slower, etc.; therefore, little verbal communication took place, significantly less than for the previous three stories or the succeeding one for which a dictation was given. The dictation was completed in only eight minutes, and although it was the most "correct" of the five dictations, it was the least successful in terms of real communication. There were no requests to go back over any of the already-dictated sentences, once the whole story had been dictated, as there were with the other four dictations.

For the next thirty-five minutes, at the students' request, we watched portions of the videotape.

Next, I passed out copies of the original story, which the students compared to their versions. Very few differences were found between the two; thus, there was little discussion of the two versions. The students had a number of vocabulary questions--"tragedy," which Hashi had defined during the sequencing as "making sick," and today he defined as, "Something bad--example, somebody is dead." Yozo asked for the meaning of "crash" and Kazuyo translated it while indicating the action with her hands. Kaji asked if "just before midnight" was the same as "about midnight" and Hashi told him that "about midnight is maybe before, maybe after." We finished the hour by working on the use of "in" and "on" with dates, since Yozo had repeatedly confused the two while ordering the story and had said, without correction from the other students, "on April 1912" when he dictated his sentence. The students took a ten-minute break and returned for the remaining fifteen minutes of class.

Hour 11: As soon as the students had discarded their strips for Strip Story #5, Kaji began saying his sentence and everyone else quickly said theirs. Previously, someone, usually Hashi, had said, "Begin," or indicated with a gesture that the person sitting at the far left should begin. Each student said his or her sentence at least four times and Yozo and Mariko said theirs five times before they began ordering the story. Yozo, for the first time, began to volunteer his opinion about what order the story should take; he did this almost completely in Japanese. Although Hashi had used much more English than usual in the videotaped story, he used very little in this day's lesson. Most of his suggestions on what order the story

should follow and his reasons for the ordering were given either in Japanese or in a mixture of Japanese and English, along with gestures. After eighteen minutes, the students said that they were ready to retell the story to me, and they said their sentences in the following order: #1, 3, 4, 2, 5. When I asked if everyone was satisfied with that ordering, the answer, for the first time, was "No." Kazuyo said, "No, I'm after Yozo," which then changed the order to #1, 3, 4, 5, 2. The rest of the class was not satisfied with this ordering. As our class time was now up, we planned to continue with the story at our next class meeting, six days later. Six days intervened because of the Christmas holidays.

Day 8

Hour 12: When the students began working on the story from the previous class, they started with two minutes of one-to-one conversation in Japanese, most of it between Kazuyo and Mariko, and Hashi and Kaji, with Yozo listening to what they were saying. Kazuyo then gave her sentence (#2) and Hashi his (#4). Each of the sentences was given very haltingly with much interjection of Japanese and extended class discussion in Japanese. There were also more stretches of total or near-total silence than there had been since the first class. After the last stretch of intermittent one-to-one conversation in Japanese intermixed with silence, by which time they had been trying unsuccessfully for thirteen minutes to remember their sentences from the week before, Hashi laughed and said, "Can we see our sentences one time?" When the rest of the class indicated that

they would like to take another look at their sentences, I passed out the strips again and after looking at them for less than a minute they discarded them and began saying their sentences quite rapidly one-by-one. Eight minutes later they told me that they were ready and gave me the story in the original order. Kaji asked me if I had ever seen the air pollution in Tokyo and he, Hashi, and Kazuyo then began to tell me about it. Yozo made a comment about the clean air in Hawaii, which led to a short discussion of the differences between Japan and Hawaii with regard to pollution. When I asked how they would solve the problem of pollution, all of them except Mariko volunteered an opinion. When a student did not know how to express a thought in English, he or she said it in Japanese and in most cases somebody in the class was able to suggest a way to say it in English so that I could understand. There was no dictation for this story. After reading the original that I passed out, the students commented to me and to one another, partly in English and partly in Japanese, on some of the deletions they had made when saying their sentences (such as "all" in sentence #5 and "so" in #3).

Day 9

Hour 13: Post-test

Hour 14: Strip Story #6 was tape recorded. Although the students felt that the sentences in this story were very long (When Hashi saw his, he said, "Oh, so long!") it took them only nineteen minutes to put it in order. After nine minutes, they were able to sequence the story; however, because there was disagreement on this sequencing,

they continued to work for another ten minutes. At the end of this time, everyone was satisfied with the story, which was in the same order as the original, and the same order it had been in ten minutes before. Yozo handled his long sentence (#4) by paraphrasing it and eliminating the word "resorts"; he said "the mountain" and "the seaside"; Kazuyo eliminated "carefully" from #5. Hashi asked "what means brochure?" and Kazuyo first answered at some length in Japanese and then said "pamphlet." In this story, as in previous ones, the students used a mixture of Japanese, English, and gestures to put the story in order.

After spending ten and a half minutes on the dictation, the students compared their version with the original that I passed out. Then they asked questions about such things as "resort," the use of "Ms," and the pronunciation of "description." The last six minutes of the class were spent listening to the tape of the lesson.

Day 10

Hour 15: During this, our last class meeting, Kazuyo was absent, so the remaining sentence after the students had randomly chosen their strips was written on the board. This happened to be the last sentence in the story. By chance, the students chose their sentences in the order in which they appeared in the story. Nevertheless, it took them thirty-six minutes to put this story together to everyone's satisfaction. They became very frustrated in their attempts to order it in a way that satisfied everyone. A great deal of the discussion on the ordering was done in Japanese. Students corrected their own

mistakes quite frequently. In sentence #3, Hashi said "lift" and then corrected it to "left." Yozo said "where" for "who" in sentence #4, and then went back and repeated himself, changing it to "who." He also said his sentence phrase by phrase, explaining the meaning in Japanese as he went along. Mariko, as usual, said her sentence when it was appropriate to do so and did not participate actively in the discussion about ordering the story or ask many questions of other students. Throughout the program, Mariko's sentences were the most consistently correct and her spontaneous questions, comments, and suggestions the least in number. Most of her questions and comments were made to Kazuyo, mainly in Japanese.

The remaining fourteen minutes of class were spent on a discussion of non-verbal communication and a comparison of various gestures used in Japan and the United States.

IV. Test Results and Interpretation

4.1 Variables

Some of the variables to be considered when discussing the results of the pre- and post-tests are:

Teacher: "...a source of difficulty in research in second language teaching is found in the teacher-student interaction." (H. Douglas Brown 1973: 242) Because of my previous experience with the Strip Story technique, I was enthusiastic about it. This, although I attempted to be as dispassionate and objective as possible, is certain to have had an effect on both the students' attitude and their performance. Furthermore, the students were regularly meeting with four other teachers for fourteen additional hours of classroom instruction. It would be impossible to determine how much of the students' gains or losses in test scores could be attributed to these other teachers, other techniques, and other materials.

Materials: Although I had control over the materials used in my classes, I had none over the materials used in the students' remaining fourteen hours of classroom instruction. I did ask that none of the other teachers use the Strip Story technique with either group.

Motivation: "Pimsleur, Sundlund, and McIntyre indicated that motivation and verbal ability are the most important factors in achievement." (Hancock 1972: 147) Because the students were enrolled voluntarily in the English program, one would expect a fairly high level of motivation to learn English. However, because their backgrounds, age, and personalities were varied, their personal reasons for wanting to study

English were probably equally varied; thus, it is reasonable to assume that the source and degree of motivation differed for each student.

Personality: Because each student had his or her "own set of cognitive and affective preferences" (H. Douglas Brown 1973: 242) it is reasonable to expect differing degrees of acceptance of or resistance to the techniques used with both groups. This, in turn, could be expected to affect students' test scores.

Jakobovits and Gordon may be correct in their assertion that "what the investigator can measure does not represent what the student has learned, and vice versa." (1974: 90)

4.2 Attitude Toward English Scale

A copy of the attitude scale appears in Appendix B. Results appear in Appendix D and E. A total of only eleven incidences of attitude change (out of a possible thirty-five) were recorded for the control group (five to what could be called a more favorable attitude and six to a less favorable one); eight were recorded for the experimental group (five to a more favorable attitude and three to a less favorable one). In the control group every student showed a change of attitude on at least one question, as did four out of five in the experimental group (Kazuyo's post-test answers were identical to her pre-test ones).

One interesting result was that none of the responses to #7 reflected a favorable attitude. Eighteen of twenty responses to #7 were "c"; one student changed from "a" to "c," and another from "c" to "d"--"I'm prepared half the time."

In general, there was little correlation between attitude and performance scores, as Appendix F and G show. Appendix F also shows that no student chose 3d or 5a, either in the pre-test or the post-test, choices which I feel reflect a strong negative attitude toward English. Only one student chose 6c.

Student C1732 had the lowest performance scores in the control group, and his post-test second listening score was one point lower than his pre-test score. However, his attitude post-test did not clearly reflect this. Of the four attitude changes that were recorded, two were to a more favorable attitude and two were to a less favorable one. Of his seven responses, only one (6c) could be said to reflect a completely unfavorable attitude. This response was the same in both the pre-test and the post-test. Student C4494, who gained the most in his post-test second listening score (4.95 points) showed three changes in attitude, all to a less favorable attitude.

In the experimental group, Kaji, who had the highest pre-test and post-test scores in three out of four measurements, showed three attitude changes, all to a less favorable attitude. Mariko, who gained the most in her post-test second listening score (6 points), changed only one of her responses from the pre-test to the post-test. This response showed a change to a more favorable attitude. Although her attitude pre-test and post-test showed a favorable attitude toward English, her performance scores were not correspondingly high, particularly in the pre-test.

The fact that the subjects' responses reflected generally high attitudes to begin with (whether true attitudes or attitudes that would

obviously please the grader is impossible to determine) may explain why there was little correlation between attitude and performance scores, and why there was relatively little attitude change.

The following should be considered when reading the attitude test results:

1) I did not count a student as having made a "change" if the student wrote a "d" answer in the post-test that had the same meaning as his or her pre-test choice. (Example: #4--pre-test: b
post-test: d--"Normal")

2) I did record a change if a "d" answer in the post-test had a different meaning from a "d" answer in the pre-test. (Example:
#2 pre-test: d--"Not so interested that I become absorbed."
post-test: d--"I come close to losing myself.")

3) In three cases it was very difficult to make a decision as to whether an answer did in fact reflect an attitude change. (Example: In #4, a change from d--"I try to do my best." to b--"I am not interested enough to get the job done") was counted as a change to a less favorable attitude. I was not able to make a decision on the following two, and so I discounted them:

#7--pre-test: a
post-test: c
#1--pre-test: b
post-test: c

4) In two questions "d" was chosen and then the student wrote an answer that had no relation to the question. Therefore, both of them had to be discounted when I was determining attitude changes.

4.3 Performance test

There was, in general, a positive correlation between the first and the second listening scores in both the pre-test and the post-test, as the rank ordering in Appendix H shows. Except for the control group's pre-test, there was little if any difference between students' rank according to the first listening score and the second listening score. There was little change in the order after four weeks of instruction--the top students remained at the top and the bottom ones at the bottom. The extremely small number of students in each group makes any discussion of rank ordering much less valuable and interesting than it might be in a larger sample.

The difference between the control group's pre-test and post-test first listening scores (the completely subjective listening) was significant at a level of $<.05$ (the pre-test mean was 1.05 and the post-test mean was 2.10); the difference was significant at a level of $<.01$ for the experimental group (the pre-test mean was 1.87 and the post-test mean was 2.67). However, the difference of the pre-test and post-test first listening scores of the control group vs. that of the experimental group was not significant (the mean difference was .6 for the control group and .75 for the experimental group). See Appendix I.

Neither the control nor the experimental group showed a significant difference between their pre-test and post-test second listening scores, as is shown in Appendix I (the control group's pre-test mean was 19.98 and the post-test mean was 21.89. The experimental group's pre-test mean was 21.93 and the post-test mean was 23.95).

These findings, although suggestive, are far from definitive; therefore, further investigation using larger samples is recommended.

Because, as Harris says, "no language skill is so difficult to assess with precision as speaking ability," (1969: 81) and because "for the most part second language teaching is inevitably seen through a distorting lens," (Cook 1973: 14-15) truly objective performance test scores are difficult if not impossible to arrive at. Perhaps less "distorting" is close observation of students actually using the Strip Story technique.

Were I to repeat this experiment without the restrictions on time and money that I was under, I would videotape a number of both the control group and the experimental group's classes. After identifying certain behaviors which indicate that students are communicating with one another and that language learning is taking place, I would then be able to closely observe and compare specific behaviors in both groups over a period of time. Such observation would be sure to yield more than the tentative though suggestive evidence which can be seen in Strip Story #4, which was videotaped. The evidence from this videotape that a great deal of real communication and language learning took place is discussed more fully in the following section.

V. Discussion Based on Observation of the Strip Story Technique

5.1 Listening is an active process

The statement that "all indications so far seem to point to the conclusion that listening comprehension is an active process and not a passive one" (Angelis 1973: 103) is supported by observation of the Strip Story technique. During Strip Story #4, Yozo and Mariko seldom said anything other than their own sentences, and most of what other utterances they did make were made in Japanese. Yet it was obvious that they were following what was going on. Mariko nodded in agreement at several of the other students' suggestions and she once indicated to herself what order she thought the story should follow by pointing unobtrusively. Both she and Yozo constantly "wrote" on their desks with a finger while other students were talking. During the dictation, when Hashi began to dictate sentence #3 with "All of the people were..." Yozo interrupted him with "passengers," which was, in fact, the word that had been used during the sequencing of the story the previous day.

5.2 Students use extralinguistic clues to convey meaning

As Rivers points out, when we listen to a foreign language, we can absorb only a certain amount of information at one time. (1966: 197) Only the individual student knows how much listening it will take him or her to understand what is being said. Says Angelis, "As the student of the language learns what to expect he can more easily process and understand what he hears." (1973: 103) As students using the Strip Story technique said their sentences again and again, more and more of

the communication became understandable to the individual listener, and he or she could begin anticipating or guessing which ideas might follow one another; this further aided understanding.

It is clear from observing the Strip Story technique that

> over and above the clues provided by sound sequences, we convey further elements of meaning by body movements, facial expression, slight changes in breathing, length of pauses and degrees of emphasis...elements...usually classed as kinesics and paralanguage...No comprehension of oral communication is complete without taking these aspects into consideration as further delimitations of the message. (Rivers 1966: 198)

The most striking example of the use of extralinguistic clues to convey meaning was the students' use of gestures to demonstrate such parts of their sentences as "sank," "change course," "all of the passengers," and "ballroom." These and other gestures were used frequently when the students were trying to determine which ideas followed one another. Kaji made his sentence (#4) easier to understand by pausing slightly before "cried" and emphasizing "iceberg"; this led Hashi to realize that the iceberg presented a hazard of some sort, for he felt that the sailor's cry meant that the ship "get accident." All of the students acted just as people do when they communicate outside the language classroom. They leaned intently when they were listening to another student or when they were trying to convince the others to accept a particular ordering. They nodded to show agreement; they showed puzzlement by a frown or by the angle of the head; they shifted in their seats to have a conversation with a single student instead of talking to the entire class--in short, they used all of the communicative tools that people

use in real communication. In contrast, "artificially contrived messages, such as those frequently used in foreign-language classes, often unwittingly reduce the amount of redundancy supplied by a speaker in a normal situation." (Rivers 1966: 198)

I had expected that the students would move around and seat themselves in an order matching the order of the story, as other classes using the Strip Story technique had done; however, they did not stand up and move around in this lesson or in any other one. I was not sure if this was because, since they never had to arrange a story of more than eight sentences, movement was unnecessary, or if Japanese students in general would not tend to move around the classroom.

5.3 Students really communicate

An important result of the Strip Story technique was that students communicated unpredictable information. Real communication began immediately in Strip Story #4, with this exchange:

Hashi: "I want a short sentence."

Teacher: "Sorry, I don't think there are any short sentences."

It continued throughout the story as students asked questions of one another ("Ballroom--the meaning of ballroom?" "How do you spell?" "Trade winds?" "A sailor cried iceberg and then the passengers come all together in the ballroom?"), as they gave commands ("Spell." "Make your sentence perfect." "Your sentence."), as they tried to persuade the others of the correctness of a particular ordering (Kaji: "I think the sailor cried iceberg, then the passengers come

to the ballroom."

Hashi: "All the passengers in the beautiful ballroom then--m-m-m--
'cry sailor' I think means get accident. If get accident
then the passengers are in ballroom. What do you think?"),

as they spelled words and defined them ("Tragedy means making sick."), as they paraphrased sentences ("...#2 is the sentence about the weather conditions; #3 about the sea; #4 the sailor cried iceberg..."), and as they corrected one another

(Kazuyo: "Before the ship changed a course."
Hashi: "Changed course."
Hashi: "All of the people were..."
Yozo: "Passengers."
Hashi: "All of the passengers were...").

Because students were really communicating with one another, there was no need to worry about how to maintain student interest in the lesson or to follow such suggestions as Carroll's that the teacher periodically introduce questions or other stimuli that require the students to pay close attention to the material. (1973: 358) The students needed no stimulus other than that provided by the nature of the problem itself.

5.4 Students participate without threat or fear

To me, the most important result of the Strip Story technique was that the students were able to participate without threat or fear in their own and their classmates' learning using a technique that follows Carroll's advice that "we must consider the student's age, his

intelligence, his 'aptitude for language,' his motivation, his prior experience with languages (including his own), and so on" (1953: 170)--in other words, Curran's "whole person." The importance of providing a non-threatening atmosphere is clear to many teachers. Says Rivers:

> If the student has an unsympathetic relationship with his teacher, or does not feel at home with his classmates, he may well feel that what he would like to say can be of little interest to them, or would not be appreciated by them. On the other hand, he may be very conscious of his limitations in the foreign-language and feel that by expressing himself in it, he is laying himself open to censure or ridicule..." (1971: 192)

What has been less clear is how to provide an atmosphere in which the student does not feel the threat of censure or ridicule; also not clear has been how to follow Stevick's suggestion that "built into the materials may be opportunities to become better acquainted with instructors and classmates." (1971: 25) The Strip Story technique, I feel, provides a means to do these things.

5.5 Students can retain their own identity

Observation of the Strip Story technique indicates that H. Douglas Brown's conclusion that "a person is forced to take on a new identity if he is to become competent in a second language" (1973: 233) may in fact be untrue. Hashi, the oldest member of the class and a talkative leader outside class, tended to lead the organization of the Strip Stories and to do a lot of talking. Mariko, on the other hand, was very quiet and reserved outside of class, and was able to retain her identity in the classroom. From my observation, the students' personalities in the halls between classes and at their Christmas party were no different from the personalities they

exhibited in class.

Richard Via of the Culture Learning Institute at the University of Hawaii's East West Center has feelings that are similar to Gibson's and mine regarding the importance of retaining one's identity in the language classroom. Through his use of what he calls the drama method of teaching English, he has discovered that it is through retaining their own identity, not through losing it, that students can effectively learn a second language. According to Via, "the drama method is aimed at helping the student to free himself to express his true feelings on a moment to moment basis." (1975: 90)

Like Gibson, Via feels that the student learns "through the experience of communicating the language"; like Gibson, Via places the emphasis off language and on an external problem--"All emphasis should be placed on the play and its production."; like Gibson, Via feels that "for our students to succeed we need to give them security, freedom, and a feeling of success." (1975: 19-22) Via's attitude toward a language learner's being forced to take on a new identity can best be expressed by the following quotation from Constantin Stanislavski, which appears in Via's English in Three Acts:

> Do you expect an actor to invent all sorts of new sensations, or even a new soul, for every part he plays? Can he tear out his own soul and replace it by one he has rented as being more suitable to a certain part? You can borrow "things" of all sorts, but you cannot take feelings from another person. My feelings are inalienably mine, and yours belong to you in the same way. (1975: 86)

Because the Strip Story technique emphasizes the person rather than the material, the students were free to experience being themselves

in the language classroom and acting in a way that was comfortable for them. They were able to follow Stanislavski's advice to "always act in your own person...you can never get away from yourself." (Via 1975: 87) By acting in their own person, they were able to experience what Curran calls the "warm, deep sense of belonging and sharing with another person--the one who knows--and with others engaged with him in the learning enterprise that truly facilitates learning and invests it with profound personal meaning." (1972: 23)

VI. Suggestions For Further Research

It is likely that what this experiment has measured does not represent what the student has learned (See section 4.1). In order to determine more clearly the effects of the Strip Story technique on students' foreign language performance, I would suggest that further research focus more closely on actual student behavior in the language classroom. After student behaviors which indicate that learning is taking place have been identified, trained observers could observe videotaped lessons and compare the frequency of such behaviors occurring in the control group and the experimental group.

Joan Rubin has identified some specific acts which she feels offer "some good insights into the cognitive processes that seem to be going on in good language learners." (1975: 48) A number of these acts could be observed and quantified without a great deal of difficulty. They are the following:

1) The good language learner is a willing and accurate guesser.

2) ...he is willing to do many things to get his meaning across [circumlocution, paraphrase, gestures, spelling, use of the native language, etc.].

3) He is willing to make mistakes. [Related to this, I think, is willingness to admit ignorance and to seek help from others in the class.]

4) [He] is constantly looking for patterns in the language.

5) [He] initiates converations with the teacher and his fellow students in the foreign language.

6) The good language learner monitors his own and the speech of others. (1975: 45-47) (One indication that the Strip Story encourages the learner to make use of this particular strategy is the fact that the control group had 14 instances of self-correction in the post-test performance tapes, while

the experimental group had 24).

Once the researcher has identified specific behaviors which indicate that learning is taking place, the problem of training observers must be dealt with. According to Ned A. Flanders,

> The problem of observer training is twofold: first, converting men into machines, and second, keeping them in that condition while they are observing. The ideal observer team is a group of like-minded individuals who will respond consistently with the same category number when presented with the same communication events. The problem is twofold because once training has produced an acceptable level of reliability, it can still deteriorate due to the unending variety of judgements that arise and require consistent treatment. Apparently no system of training can anticipate all of the judgements that an observer will be required to make. (Amidon and Hough 1967: 158)

Although it is highly likely that no training system can anticipate all of the judgements that an observer will be called upon to make, certain guidelines can be followed to ensure that the observer is as well-prepared and reliable as possible. Flanders has found that successful teaching experience, particularly in the elementary field, is a strong indicator of success as a reliable observer; thus, language teachers may be among the most reliable observers possible. Flanders' guidelines for achieving observer reliability can be summed up in the following way:

> Consistent observation by a team requires group training, discussion of common ground rules, each observer's understanding of his own unique biases, and regular meetings after training to discuss unusual categorization problems. (Amidon and Hough 1967: 161)

The current trend in ESOL seems to be towards the use of techniques which foster communicative competence, which Christina Bratt Paulston defines as "the social rules of language use" as

opposed to "simply linguistic interaction in the target language." (1974: 347) The problem facing ESOL teachers can best be summed up by Frank M. Grittner's statement in his presentation at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (April 26-28, 1973):

> "...our problem is how to get a much larger percentage of students to relate in a genuine manner to anyone or anything in that part of the human cultural heritage which we call the foreign language field." (1973: 265)

With the likelihood that communicative competence cannot be adequately measured with paper and pencil tests, those researching the effects of techniques which encourage communicative competence will need new tools for measurement. Reliable observer teams identifying and quantifying students' classroom behavior can do a great deal toward providing more concrete evidence than this experiment has been able to provide about the effects of the use of the Strip Story and other student-directed techniques on foreign language performance. Furthermore, it may lead to what Earl Stevick feels is essential for foreign language teachers today, "that we should become accustomed to a new way of seeing." (1974: 384)

APPENDIX A

Strip Stories

#1
1. A dog had stolen a piece of meat from a butcher shop.
2. On his way home he was crossing a river.
3. Suddenly he saw himself reflected in the river.
4. He thought it was another dog.
5. He thought the dog had another piece of meat.
6. He decided to steal that piece of meat too.
7. He opened his mouth to seize it.
8. When he did this he dropped the piece of meat he was carrying, and so he lost both pieces.

#2
1. Once there was a shepherd boy who took care of his sheep near a village.
2. He used to amuse himself by shouting, "Wolf, Wolf!"
3. Two or three times the trick succeeded and everyone in the village came running to help him.
4. The boy just laughed when they arrived.
5. One day, a wolf really did come.
6. The boy shouted but this time nobody paid any attention to him, and the wolf ate all his sheep.
7. So the boy learned, too late, that liars are not believed even when they tell the truth.

#3 1. Hawaii is filled with many wonders.

2. First, there is the pleasant climate, which is caused by the northeast trade wind.

3. Second, there are the flowers.

4. Finally, there are the people.

5. The population is made up of Caucasians, Orientals, people from the Pacific Islands, and Hawaiians.

6. All of these people live together harmoniously.

#4 1. The tragedy of the steamship Titanic happened on April 14, 1912.

2. The sea was calm and the weather was beautiful that night.

3. All of the passengers were gathered in the beautiful ballroom.

4. Suddenly, just before midnight, a sailor cried, "Iceberg!"

5. Before the ship could change course, it crashed into the iceberg and sank.

#5 1. In many large cities, air pollution is a threat to human health.

2. It can become a threat to plants and animals too.

3. Because air pollution is so dangerous, we must try to preserve pure air.

4. What is pure air?

5. It is a mixture of gases and water vapor necessary for all higher forms of life.

#6 1. Last year Mr. Kelly decided to take his family on a vacation.

2. His wife wanted to go to the mountains, but he wanted to go to the seashore.

3. He went to a travel agency and got some travel brochures to help them decide.

4. Some of the brochures described mountain resorts, and the others described seaside resorts.

5. Even after reading the brochures carefully, Mr. and Mrs. Kelly couldn't decide where to go.

#7 1. While Mrs. Dean was shopping in a small shop in Bangkok, she put her purse down and forgot all about it.

2. When she left the shop, the clerk hurried out and motioned for her to come back.

3. Mrs. Dean thought the gesture meant "good-bye" so she got into a taxi and left.

4. When she got back to her hotel and could not pay for her taxi she remembered where she had left her purse.

5. When she returned to the shop, the clerk told her that the gesture meant "come back," and not "good-bye."

Strip Stories #1, 2, and 4 were adapted from selections found in Mary Finocchiaro and Violet Hoch Lavenda's Selections for Developing English Language Skills, Regents Publishing Co., 1973. #3 was adapted from a selection in Richard C. Yorkey's Study Skills for Students of ...lish as a Second Language, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1970. #6 came from ...rientation in Business English, Institute of Modern Languages, Washington, D.C., 1972.

APPENDIX B

NUMBER_____

English Translation of Attitude Toward English Scale

Make an X next to the letter (a, b, c, d) that is correct for you for each statement.

1. When I have an assignment to do in English, I

___a) do it immediately.
___b) become completely bored.
___c) put it off.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

2. During English classes, I

___a) become completely bored.
___b) pay attention but am not really interested.
___c) become wholly absorbed in the subject matter.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

3. If I had the opportunity and knew enough English, I would read English newspapers and magazines

___a) as often as I could.
___b) fairly regularly.
___c) probably not very often.
___d) never.

4. After I have been studying English for a short time, I find that I

___a) have a tendency to think about other things.
___b) am interested enough to get the assignment done.
___c) become very much interested in what I am studying.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

NUMBER_____

5. I believe that English should be

___a) replaced by another required language in the school curriculum in Japan. What language?_____
___b) taught only to those students who wish to study it.
___c) taught to all high school students.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

6. I find studying English

___a) very interesting.
___b) no more interesting than most subjects.
___c) not interesting at all.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

7. In my English classes, I

___a) am generally not prepared unless I know that the teacher will ask for the assignments.
___b) am always prepared for each lesson having done my assignments or read the material we are to cover.
___c) am sometimes prepared for the lesson, but mostly not.
___d) none of these (Explain) _____

APPENDIX C

Performance Test

1. When were you born and how old are you?
2. How did you get to Hawaii?
3. What do you think about the weather in Hawaii?
4. Where are you staying in Hawaii?
5. What are the four seasons in Japan?
6. Describe what you're wearing today.
7. What did you eat for dinner last night?
8. What does the Japanese flag look like?
9. What is miso soup?
10. Tell about your family.

APPENDIX D

Attitude Test Results (By Group)

	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
1.	a 1	2	1	2
	b 0	1	0	0
	c 3	1	3	3
	d 1	1	1	0
2.	a 0	0	0	0
	b 1	1	0	0
	c 1	3	3	4
	d 3	1	2	1
3.	a 4	1	1	3
	b 0	3	4	1
	c 1	1	0	1
	d 0	0	0	0
4.	a 0	0	0	1
	b 4	2	4	3
	c 1	1	0	1
	d 0	2	1	0
5.	a 0	0	0	0
	b 0	2	1	2
	c 3	2	4	3
	d 2	1	0	0
6.	a 3	4	4	5
	b 1	1	1	0
	c 0	0	0	0
	d 1	0	0	0
7.	a 0	1	0	0
	b 0	0	0	0
	c 5	4	5	4
	d 0	0	0	1

APPENDIX E
Attitude Changes (By Group)

	To a More Favorable Attitude		To a Less Favorable Attitude	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
1.	1	0	1	1
2.	3	1	1	0
3.	1	2	3	0
4.	0	0	1	2
5.	0	0	0	0
6.	0	1	0	0
7.	0	1	0	0
Total	5	5	6	3

APPENDIX F

Pre- and Post- Attitude Test Results (By Individual)

CONTROL

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C3314	d/d	d/c	c/b	b/b	d/b	a/a	c/c
C4994	a/c	c/d	a/b	b/b	c/c	a/a	c/c
C1096	c/c	d/d	a/a	b/d	c/c	d/a	c/c
C6476	c/c	d/c	a/b	b/b	d/c	b/b	c/c
C1732	c/a	b/c	a/b	c/b	c/c	c/c	c/c

EXPERIMENTAL

Kazuyo	a/a	c/c	a/a	c/c	b/b	a/a	c/c
Kaji	d/c	c/c	b/b	d/a	d/c	a/a	c/d
Mariko	c/c	d/d	b/a	b/b	c/c	a/a	c/c
Yozo	b/c	b/c	c/c	d/b	c/c	b/a	a/c
Hashi	a/a	c/c	b/a	b/b	b/b	a/a	c/c

APPENDIX G

Performance Test Scores (By Individual)

First Listening Score

	Control					Experimental				
	C3314	C4994	C1096	C6476	C1732	Kazuyo	Kaji	Mariko	Yozo	Hashi
Pre-test	2.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	
Post-test	3.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	1.5	1.0
Difference	.5	1.0	1.0	.5	0	1.0	0	1.5	.5	

Second Listening Score

Pre-test	22.20	19.10	20.10	19.10	19.40	22.40	25.90	18.40	21.05	
Post-test	24.40	24.05	21.50	21.10	18.40	25.60	25.70	24.40	20.10	18.50
Difference	2.20	4.95	1.40	2.00	1.00	3.20	0.20	6.00	0.95	

APPENDIX H

Rank Ordering of Students According to Performance Test Scores

Control		Experimental	
First Listening	Second Listening	First Listening	Second Listening
Pre-test		Pre-test	
1. 3314	1. 3314	1. Kaji	1. Kaji
2. 6476/4994	2. 1096	2. Kazuyo	2. Kazuyo
4. 1096/1732	3. 1732	3. Yozo/Mariko	3. Yozo
	4. 6476/4994		4. Mariko
Post-test		Post-test	
1. 3314	1. 3314	1. Kazuyo	*1. Kaji
2. 4994	2. 4994	2. Kaji	2. Kazuyo
3. 6476/1096	3. 1096	3. Mariko	3. Mariko
5. 1732	4. 6476	4. Yozo	4. Yozo
	5. 1732	(5. Hashi)	(5. Hashi)

*The difference between the first two scores was only .10.

APPENDIX I (cont'd)

Second Listening

Control				Experimental			
Pre-test	Post-test	D	D^2	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D^2
22.20	24.40	-2.20	4.840	22.40	25.60	-3.20	10.240
19.10	24.05	-4.95	24.502	25.90	25.70	+0.20	.040
20.10	21.50	-1.40	1.960	18.40	24.40	-6.00	36.000
19.10	21.10	-2.00	4.000	21.05	20.10	+0.95	.903
19.40	18.40	+1.00	1.000	87.75	95.80	-8.05	47.183
99.90	109.45	-9.55	36.302	mean 21.937	mean 23.950		
mean 19.98	mean 21.89						
t_4 1.515 (not significant)				t_3 1.251 (not significant)			

APPENDIX I (cont'd)

Difference of control group's pre- and post-test scores (first listening) vs. experimental group's pre- and post-test scores (first listening).

Control			Experimental		
Difference	$X-\bar{X}$		Difference	$Y-\bar{Y}$	
.5	-.1	.01	1.0	.25	.063
1.0	.4	.16	0	-.75	.563
1.0	.4	.16	1.5	.75	.563
.5	-.1	.01	.5	-.25	.063
0	-.6	.36	3.0		1.252
3.0		.70			
mean .6			mean .75		

t_7 .424 (not significant)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amidon, Edmund J. and John B. Hough, eds. Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.

Angelis, Paul J. "The Importance and Diversity of Aural Comprehension Training." Modern Language Journal, 57 (March 1973), 102-106.

Aronson, Elliot et al. "The Jigsaw Route to Learning and Liking." Psychology Today, February 1975, 43-50.

Ausubel, David P. "Adult Versus Children in Second Language Learning: Psychological Considerations." Modern Language Journal, 48 (November 1964), 420-424.

Brown, H. Douglas. "Affective Variables in Second Language Acquisition." Language Learning, 23 (December 1973), 231-243.

Brown, Roger. "Development of the First Language in the Human Species." American Psychologist, 28 (February 1973), 97-106.

Carroll, John B. "Some Suggestions From a Psycholinguist." TESOL Quarterly, 7 (December 1973), 355-367.

_____ The Study of Language. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Cook, Vivian J. "The Analogy Between First and Second Language Learning." IRAL, 7 (August 1969), 207-216.

_____ "The Comparison of Language Development in Native Children and Foreign Adults." IRAL, 11 (February 1973), 13-28.

Cooper, Robert L. "What Do We Learn When We Learn a Language?" TESOL Quarterly, 4 (December 1970), 303-314.

Corder, S.P. "The Significance of Learner's Errors." IRAL, 4 (November 1967), 161-169.

Curran, Charles A. Counseling-Learning, A Whole-Person Model for Education. N.Y.: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1972.

Dulay, Heidi and Marina Burt. "Errors and Strategies in Child Second Language Acquisition." TESOL Quaterly, 8 (June 1974), 129-136.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "An Issei Learns English." Journal of Social Issues, 23 (April 1967), 78-89.

_____ "Is Second Language Learning Like the First?" TESOL Quarterly, 8 (June 1974), 111-127.

Falk, Julia S. Linguistics and Language. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox College Publishing, 1973.

Gibson, Robert. "The Strip Story: A Catalyst for Communication." TESOL Quarterly, 9 (June 1975), 154-159.

Grittner, Frank M. "The Foreign Language Teacher: Present and Future Tense." Modern Language Journal, 57 (September-October 1973), 262-268.

Hancock, Charles R. "Student Aptitude, Attitude, and Motivation." Foreign Language Education: A Reappraisal. Ed. Dale L. Lange, Charles J. James. Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1972.

Harris, David P. Testing English as a Second Language. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Jakobovits, Leon. Foreign Language Learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1970.

_____ and Barbara Gordon. The Context of Foreign Language Teaching. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1974.

La Forge, Paul G. "Community Language Learning: A Pilot Study." Language Learning, 21 (June 1971), 45-60.

Maslow, Abraham H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

Paulston, Christina Bratt. "Linguistic and Communicative Competence." TESOL Quarterly, 8 (December 1974), 347-360.

Prator, Clifford P. "Adding a Second Language." TESOL Quarterly, 3 (June 1969), 95-104.

Rapp, Don. Magnetic tape, 1974.

Ravem, Roar. "Language Acquisition in a Second Language Environment." IRAL, 6 (May 1968), 175-185.

Rivers, Wilga. "Listening Comprehension." Modern Language Journal, 50 (April 1966), 196-204.

_____ Teaching Foreign Language Skills. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Rubin, Joan. "What the Good Language Learner Can Teach Us." TESOL Quarterly, 9 (March 1975), 41-51.

Stevick, Earl. Adapting and Writing Language Lessons. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, 1971.

_____ "Language Instruction Must Do an About Face." Modern Language Journal, 58 (December 1974), 379-384.

Via, Richard A. English in Three Acts. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii (in press).

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
READING ROOM
Department of English as a Second Language